



**ANIMAL PROTECTION & CONTROL
ADVISORY BOARD
Meeting Minutes
July 24, 2003**

In Attendance:

Greg Ellison
Deen Adolphe
Shirley Malar
Debi Bidelman
Pat Jollota
Linda Cox

Staff:

Tim Jennings
Mary Liddle

Rick Collord

I. Call to Order:

The meeting was officially called to order by Pat Jollota at 6:34 p.m. Carol Williams and Dr. Elizabeth Grauer called and advised they would not be able to make the meeting.

II. Reading & Approval of the May and June 2003 minutes:

The minutes for both months were approved as written.

III. Orders of the Day

• Quarterly Report

Tim handed out Animal Control's statistics for the end of 2nd quarter. Bites were down overall 23%, vicious were slightly up. It is in hopes with all the bite presentations in the schools that the exposure is having an effect in the bite calls going down.

Calls are exploding for wildlife; Animal Control officers were out both Saturday and Sunday to assist with the Cougar off 164th Avenue. See monthly report handout for the month ending June 2003 for further numbers.

Revenue numbers are tracking with budget projections, although Animal Control has a 16-20% non-renewal rate. This turnover in pets is what requires an active license enforcement and public information campaign, such as canvassing neighborhoods.

- **Code Review**

Work session with the BOCC is next month. Should catteries and doggy daycare be added to CCO 8.11.

The leash law, example of when it is cited, and the legally stronger dog at large ordinance was discussed. Tim went over the leash law area and showed what the current areas are on a display map. The current code section is difficult, if not impossible, for a citizen to interpret. Examples of the urban growth boundary and public safety non-shooting zone ordinances were provided.

After discussion the board recommended amending the language to reflect the leash law is a requirement within the urban growth boundary.

CCC 8.18 Dangerous Dogs

RCW 16.08 Dangerous Dogs as been amended to require liability insurance, or bond, of \$250,000 up from the \$50,000. Due to the additional elements of the local code, the prosecuting attorney's office as stated our local code is still stronger than the state statute with it's \$50,000 requirement. The local code needs to be amended to reflect consistency with the state regulation.

APC is proposing all Dangerous Dogs should be photographed, and micro-chipped, to aid in future identification and transfer among jurisdictions.

- **No More Homeless Pet Coalition**

The board discussed the feedback from non-profits fostering pets. (See attachment) Greg thought a limitation on how many fosters per organization should not be required. It was discussed how these are only examples of other jurisdictions intended to garner thoughts and feedback. The PA's office will draft actual code.

IV. Roundtable

Rick Collord gave the quarterly statistics for the SW WA Humane Society as seen below:

DOGS

Receiving – Up 16%
Adoptions – Up 61%
Euthanasia – Up
Redemption – Up 8%

CATS

Receiving – Up 1%
Adoptions – Up 2%
Euthanasia – Down
Redemption – Up

The SW Washington Humane Society is working regularly with PETSMART to have animals there all the time. Rick mentioned he was looking for an east county storefront for cat adoptions. All the programs supported by grants from the Bob Barker Foundation, PETSMART and the County Animal Control were going very well.

Rick spoke at length about the ICO chip that Oregon Humane wants to use. No scanners in the United States are able to read these chips from Canada and the SWWHS released a PSA to that affect and how the use of this chip could be endangering pet's lives.

Greg questioned the definitions on cattery and foster as well as licensing, licensing of adoptions, inspections and what standards would be used. He asked if the county would accept an inspection by CFA in lieu of a county inspection of a hobby cattery. Staff explained the hobby registrations have no inspection criteria. Since it is in effect a special reduced fee for responsible pet owners engaged in hobby activity there is language in the code by requesting a HR reduced fee the applicant is agreeing to cooperate if complaints occur. This generally happens due to higher number of animals at one location.

V. New Business

There was no new business to discuss.

VI. Public Forum

It was asked that we change the location of the meeting on our web site, as the web site is incorrect.

Representatives of the Cat Fanciers Association discussed and submitted a document outlining their opposition to breeder and cattery licensing. There were questions regarding the code discussions and that we should be using the CFA guidelines in lieu of inspections. Also questions regarding when would a cat hobby be in effect.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Hearing Tribunal

Pat Jollota, Shirley Malar, and Deen Adolphe reviewed the 5 scheduled appeals after the meeting.